

Sandra Waddock & Steve Waddell: Bounce Beyond Initiative

Ju Young Lee
Postdoctoral Associate,
Ivey Business School, Western University, Canada

Abstract

Bounce Beyond is a global community of people and initiatives working to co-create a shift in our economic paradigm and foster a movement towards ‘next’ economies that support the flourishing of all life—all people and nature. What follows is an interview with Sandra Waddock, Galligan Chair of Strategy at Boston College’s Carroll School of Management and steward of Bounce Beyond, and Steve Waddell, founder and co-lead steward of Bounce Beyond.

Ju Young: Before delving deeply into Bounce Beyond, let's just start with some general questions. Modern society faces numerous societal grand challenges, such as climate change, income inequalities, health inequalities, loss of biodiversity, and so forth. COVID-19 unveiled many of them. What do you think some of the root causes are and why are there so many wicked, even super wicked, problems in our world?

Sandra: There have always been super wicked issues and problems, like poverty and inequity in our world. They have been exacerbated, I think, in the last 70 or so years, by the neoliberal economic agenda of self-interested profit maximization, growth at all costs, market primacy, and laissez-faire government, and in the last 200 years by processes of industrialization. Even before that, Enlightenment thinking dissociated humankind from nature and tried to tell us that we are somehow separate from and should have dominion over nature. That separation gets manifested in how our businesses operate, how we do our economics, what it is our governments think that they need to be aiming for.

Today, that goal seems to be constantly growing gross domestic product GDP which is itself problematic for a lot of reasons, in part because it doesn't take into account any of the negative consequences of economic activity, only that there *is* economic activity. So that disconnect, I think, has allowed us to dissociate ourselves from other people, particularly from the problems of other people, and even in many ways from ourselves sometimes. Certainly, we in the West are largely disconnected from nature. Thus, we tend to believe that humans are free to exploit nature, that we can exploit other living beings, and of course, other people. That said, in complex situations like these situations, it is next to impossible to determine the so-called root cause because everything is interrelated, dynamic, and complex.

Steve: I always have a bit of a problem with the way most people use the term ‘root causes’ because as often used, it comes out of often a linear world or a mining world. It’s like pulling a weed out of a garden, and hoping that then everything will be fine, without regard for how the weed might have propagated. So it's like a silver bullet. The idea of the root cause is appropriate

for what Dave Snowden calls simple or complicated issues, which can have solutions and identifiable causes.

But by their very nature, these grand challenges you asked about are actually complex problems, which require different approaches. I think of them as tightly interconnected issues, not identifiable problems. There is no silver bullet when we look at such challenges. I think holism means that the ‘whole’ is the key element. We don't tend to look at things from a holistic point of view, because science has divided the world up into disciplines, before and after measurements, and the like. Those divisions create very mechanistic views of the world, yet we have used the physical sciences as the ideal. The social world is very different than that. So the idea of ‘root cause’ is an application of a mental model that is totally inappropriate. There's a value system that Sandra referred to in economics today that has given primacy to short term wellbeing of individuals over collective long term interests (Waddock, 2020). Along with the lack of a holistic perspective, they have not considered the temporal, the environmental, the intergenerational perspective, or how to think about those issues.

Sandra: The core idea of Bounce Beyond is to ‘bounce beyond’ today's economy towards economies where all people and nonhuman beings can flourish. Particularly in the wake (hopefully) of the Covid-19 pandemic, the idea is not to ‘bounce back’ to the flawed economic system that existed before Covid and that many people want to return to, but to actually go beyond it to these flourishing economies. The idea is that there is not just one economy, it is not a global thing that we're looking for, but rather multiple ‘economies’ that are place, issue, and sector appropriate—a recognition from most of the participants that what needs to happen needs to come from the ground up, to meet locally generated needs and interests, not be imposed from the top down.

So let me just pick up where Steve just started to go, because if we think about the types of problems you name, as he points out, they're complex and wicked. By the very nature of those problems, we can't get to any particular specific ‘root’ cause, because there is no definitive beginning place, there is no definitive ending place. Such issues are tightly interconnected, as Steve noted. That is, they are tightly interwoven with each other. They are dynamic, which means they are constantly changing. Their outcomes are inherently unpredictable, and because actions are path-dependent, so once you start a process, you can't really reverse it because the system itself changes in irreversible ways. From that systems perspective, dealing with these types of problems is incredibly complex. We always like to think in management that we can plan change in a complex adaptive system with wicked problems. The reality is you really can't plan such a change. You can start changes, and the system starts to change, perhaps, but you can't necessarily predict what the outcomes will be or how things will evolve (Waddock, Meszoely, Waddell, & Dentoni, 2015).

Ju Young: Now that you are talking about systems, could you both give us a little primer on systems? What are ‘systems’? And how is systems thinking different from our normal understandings of the world?

Sandra: So as Steve was just saying, positivist science fragments things down into its parts and believes that you can put the pieces back together, then somehow come to an understanding of

the whole. Well, a system is a complex of *interrelated* parts. When you do take it apart, when it is a living system, you can kill it. So a system is a whole with its interrelated parts constituting that whole. With a living system, those ‘parts’ are interrelated, connected, and dynamic, that is, they are constantly in flux. Taking a more holistic perspective is necessary when you're dealing with such systems, particularly when you're trying to think about systems change.

Steve: One of the definitional qualities of systems is that there is a set of interconnected elements that are interacting with reference to a purpose. There can be an outside perspective about what the purpose is. And that's what Sandra meant. If you remove one of the parts, that purpose cannot be achieved. We deal a lot with fractals, that is some part that is self-similar to other parts of a thing, usually at different scales, like a leaf on a tree can resemble the structure of the whole tree and the leaf's shape has smaller similar shapes around the edges, which all come together with other leaves on a tree and produce a tree. You can take off one leaf, and it won't kill the tree. But if you take them all or most of them off, that tree is not going to survive.

So one way to think about the interdependence that exists in human (socio-economic) systems is that these fractals build on each other in the way they combine together to create a whole. So you have activists groups who influence communities that influence and shape the structure of states or provinces, and so on, and they have similarities at different levels in connected systems. That means that defining the boundary of a system is a major issue for people who are working on system change challenges and thinking that there's a ‘right way’ to define this particular system and boundary.

One of the common problems with economics is that it excludes people from consideration. Economics doesn't really consider regular people as an element. It has this sort of prototypical human being that is seen as a core element and that human being represents the core unit or system of the economic system—the self-interested profit maximizer. So these boundaries are often overly simplified and confusing for people. One of the boundaries that we think is particularly powerful in the change work is what we call a transformation system. So, for example, the boundary and purpose of a system, like the healthcare system, is to develop deliver health care and wellbeing, and that of the food system is to deliver food. The purpose of a transformation system is to deliver transformation for a given context. We think of transformation (or T-) systems as all of those efforts that are trying to shift the status quo in a similar direction. That doesn't mean that all the actors necessarily agree on the specific details of the transformation, but they're trying to shift it in another direction—and they generally agree on that direction (Waddock et al., 2020).

Of course, there are countervailing systems, too, that are trying to prevent that shift from happening. But by thinking of all of the changes together as creating a system, you can do things to intervene from a systems perspective. Knowing what we know about building transformation systems, we can make the transformation system much more powerful and impactful. That's the key question, *how* do we spur transformational change? How do we make the change much more responsive to our change desires—our shared aspirations? From that perspective, thinking in terms of transformation systems really provides insight to questions about how to make them more powerful and impactful.

Sandra: So let me pick up on fractals too, because if you look at a leaf on a tree, for any given tree, it will be a certain type of tree like a maple tree, or it could be a fruit tree or something else. And that leaf is likely to have the fractal quality of being self-similar to the way the branches are shaped, to the way the whole tree is shaped. In that sense, a fractal is a self-similar unit that gets smaller and smaller scale or it gets bigger, depending on which direction you're going.

One of the things we've realized is that transformation systems can evolve at multiple levels. For instance, we're working with a group of four different initiatives at this point, we call them CoNECTs or Collaborating Next Economics in Transformation. These CoNECTs have many different efforts that are going on in the context of each of them. They have the same overarching purpose of creating their version or definition of what we call a wellbeing economy or economy that supports the flourishing of all life. One is focused, for example, on sustainable seafood, while another is emphasizing regenerating Costa Rica. They are each transforming their economies uniquely, in their own way and context. But they are similar because they have these entities that are trying to achieve the same overarching goal of a flourishing future through a transformation process that aims for a shared set of values (Waddock, 2020).

If you go then to what Bounce Beyond is trying to do, we are an overarching entity that is pulling together all of these different types of initiatives that have similar purposes of evolving long term flourishing for all life. I think that's probably the easiest way to say what we are doing. So, to go back to the idea of fractals, these initiatives are self-similar in that they're all trying to accomplish similar objectives, and they are also unique in their own contexts, methods, and ways of doing things. They are guided by similar objectives and similar sets of purposes. But they're each doing it in their own context, their own way. So in that sense, each is unique and different. Just like every snowflake is similar and also unique. Just like every leaf is similar to all the others.

Ju Young: That's fascinating. Could you tell us a little more about the Bounce Beyond initiative that you just described? What is Bounce Beyond and how did it start?

Steve: Well, Bounce Beyond grew out of something called the SDG Transformation Forum. The Forum resulted from work I did leading up to the Transformation2017 conference held in Dundee, Scotland, in September of 2017. We added a day onto the conference that brought together three dozen people, including Sandra, to meet to discuss how to address what we thought as impediments to transformation. I did eight or ten months of preparation work where I interviewed a lot of people, maybe five dozen, who I saw were working on transformation.

For us, transformation has quite a specific definition. Transformation is about change where the goal of the system changes. For example, rather than just producing energy, the goal shifts to zero-carbon energy systems, which has huge ramifications for the organization, participation and technology of the energy system. That's what we mean by shifting the goal, which is always part of the system transformation process. The core question I asked all of the people was, 'What is it that is holding you back from even greater success when you're developing transformation systems?' The responses were characterized into what we now call six deep system challenges.

Some people are working on what we would call reform or incremental change, rather than transformation. We define incremental change as doing more of the same thing, such as improving the efficiency of a carbon energy system. Reform is all about changes within the current structure, such as getting the public policy in the right place or reorganizing a business to better address its goals. People working on transformation say instead, 'We actually know what public policy we need, but we can't get it. That means it's a question that deals with the governance system, or our collective action system. So yes, policy is important, governance people say. But why are we having so much trouble getting the right policy? It's because we've actually got to transform the power structures and the goals of the current governance system, when the goal of the current system is to hold the status quo in place.'

One of the other points the people I talked with brought up was the need for shifting the evaluation systems, which are historically short-term, input/output-oriented, modeled after business production, and applied to metrics like GDP and profitability, et cetera. The evaluation systems are a core problem that's holding back transformational change. We need something in evaluation processes that is more about systemic change. Sandra was particularly attentive to the narrative question that also got raised in these interviews.

Sandra: Steve talked about purpose already, yet in order to understand the purpose of an organization, you actually have a story or a narrative that sort of overarches, and that is true for any given human system, that is, socio-economic system. It could be a vision or how you define goals, mission, strategy, or purpose, for example. That story or narrative provides the sense of purpose and directionality because it defines, in a sense, what the organization is all about and how it functions. When a narrative is really core to a given system, it can be called a core cultural mythology. A cultural myths, in a way, provides a grounding for how the actors in that system relate to the world around them. It defines what our purpose here is. It becomes sort of the ontology of what is real in the world. The core narrative provides an overarching framework that, in my view, is one of the core ways you can actually guide change. Systems theorist Donella Meadows told us that if you want to make a system change, you have to find the leverage points where change can take place. And she identified a whole bunch of change levers. But the most important one she identified was mindset change, and the ability to transcend mindsets. Crucially, you need to change the story and belief systems that people have as an important aspect of system transformation to get to that mindset or paradigm shift. Then actors in the system can all act around shared purposes together, because they've got a new story that they all hopefully buy into. Or at least enough of them buy into that story so that the actions that they take are in a common direction. In complex systems undergoing transformation, while you can't predict specific actions, you can generally push the system in the direction that you're hoping and see if you want to identify the other deep challenges.

Steve: Going back to your question a bit. Another deep system challenge is finance. How do we shift the purpose of finance? Another is around collaboration, which involves shifting internal mental models and inter-personal relationships for taking collective action. The last challenge is around innovation. For instance, people who work on transformation, say, 'Yes, innovation is critically important. But look at what we're producing, with innovation, all of the electronic waste, all of the plastic, all of the environmental destruction, all this social discord. We need different, new ways to actually innovate and create innovations.'

Out of those interviews, there was a group that came together to form the SDG Transformation Forum. The Forum group worked together for about two years, maybe a couple of dozen people, and put together some sophisticated proposals but we never did succeed in getting funding. So when the Coronavirus struck in February and March, I immediately thought, ‘This is going to be a system changing event. And it's going to weaken and challenge the establishment, the structure, the legitimacy, the goals of the current systems.’

So we began conversations about what would make sense for us to do right now. One of the Forum’s people, Ioan Fazey, put me in touch with a fellow at York University, Jasper Kenter, who was interested very much in economics, and how to shift the economic paradigm. Out of that, by June, we had two sister initiatives developed. The one around economics is GANE, the Global Assessment for a New Economics (<https://www.york.ac.uk/new-economics/>). GANE is focused upon trying to develop a process similar to the IPCC climate change investigation globally, only around how economics is understood. It aims to create a rallying point for shifting the economies of the world through new economics thinking. Its activities to date include a scope review and review of economic responses to the Covid-19 pandemic.

The other initiative is Bounce Beyond (<https://www.bouncebeyond.global/>). Bounce Beyond and GANE are interrelated. GANE is about the development of new knowledge, particularly about what new economics might look like from a more theoretical perspective. GANE can also draw from the grounded work of Bounce Beyond, which is actually looking at what practitioners and people who are trying to shift the economy are doing. Bounce Beyond works with practitioners, the people shifting the economy, around particular challenges that they're facing in their transformation work. One core perspective is around three words that Sandra uses a lot, so I'll pass the discussion on to her.

Sandra: The three words Steve mentioned are: connecting, cohering, and amplifying. The idea of Bounce Beyond is to find initiatives that are already working to build transformation in their own context, whether that is a place, around an issue, or in a sector or industry. They are attempting, in their own ways, to build what we are calling the next economies. These next economies represent something new, something that aims not strictly at monetary or financial wealth, but at wellbeing for all of the participants in the system. We aim to help them connect various participants who have related goals, co-create coherent strategies and action plans that can then amplify their impact and effectiveness in achieving their goals.

Because there are often many initiatives, both large and small, working towards similar goals, that are unconnected, Bounce Beyond wants to help them connect to each other so that they form what Steve earlier called powerful transformation systems. Right now, there are many initiatives out there doing a lot of good work, yet many of them are small. Years ago, Paul Hawken calls that fragmentation of efforts *Blessed Unrest* (Hawken, 2007) in a book by that title. He said there could be as many as 2 million of these kinds of entities in the world, generally and in different ways aimed at bringing about sustainability and greater equity. But, and this was his great insight, they are all operating independently and in unconnected, fragmented ways, therefore they are not having the impact that they want to have.

So, a core idea of Bounce Beyond is to connect such initiatives that are working towards similar goals in a given context or setting—whether it is an industry, a bioregion or other place, or around an issue. One of the initiatives we're working with is the global sustainable seafood community. And they're trying to bring together the actors, various actors in the seafood production community to really think differently about how they gather and use the fish resources of the oceans. So that second process is what we mean by cohering. But it is not enough to just bring people together. Somehow, they need to co-develop a new story or narrative that has to do with what they want to accomplish together. That sensemaking process, or cohering, means that they can then act from that place of a shared sense of purpose, a shared vision, a shared set of goals, whatever they call it in their particular context. And it is going to be different in each different context.

After generating some sort of shared vision—narrative—they can then map or look at what's going on in their own system, figure out who is doing what, where things are being done, what is still needed, where the gaps are, and who might fill those gaps—the cohering process. Then they can take more effective action, which is the amplification aspect of the Bounce Beyond initiative. The idea is together they can really build out their system, to transformation strategies, and ultimately the change they hope to bring about.

Ju Young: Sandra, there are a number of what you and Steve call transformation catalysts around. How do you think Bounce Beyond is distinctive or offers unique value, compared to those other initiatives?

Sandra: The transformation catalysts who do this work of connecting, cohering, and amplifying that Steve and I have already written about (Waddock & Waddell, 2021) tend to be focused on particular kinds of issues. For example, Imperative21 is focused specifically on changing economic narratives and building business coalitions. Catalyst2030 is focused on bringing together social entrepreneurs that want to act sustainably. Bounce Beyond will work to bring together the whole ‘next economy initiatives,’ which can be place-based (like South Devon in the UK or Regenerative Costa Rica), sector-based (like sustainable seafood), or issue-based (like Canada’s Social Purpose Institute). The core idea is that they all need to form powerful transformation systems, co-created from the ground up, that can work collectively to transform their relevant context or system. If you will, Bounce Beyond works at an aggregating level, a meta-level, trying to pull a bunch of these types of initiatives together to apply transformation knowledge to them and we are particularly emphasizing the emergence and development of what we are calling ‘next economies’. These ‘next economies’ aim for the flourishing of all, including non-humans, rather than financial wealth accumulation.

To me, the idea of ‘catalytic’ has this connotation of seeing multiple initiatives acting independently, and then when you bring them together, you have something new that you didn't have before. It was the act of bringing them together that created that something new. That's the catalytic function. It hopefully turns into what Steve calls a transformation system—the collection of entities that are aiming at and taking action with respect to system transformation. In other words, one of the roles of the transformation *catalyst* is to help organize the transformation *system* so that its members can see themselves as a system and act in a coherent way with each other.

So we've got the transformation catalyst, that is, Bounce Beyond and other catalysts, bringing various initiatives together for a whole variety of different purposes. At the foundation, they are trying to create transformation systems that combine multiple elements, entities, and actions to align and cohere their work together powerfully to transform current systems such as the food system or the economic system of a geography.

Steve: There are four strategies that take place within transformation systems. In an article, I named them “Doing Change”, “Cocreating Change”, “Forcing Change”, and “Directing Change” (Waddell, 2018). Each uses a different approach. Doing change emphasizes creation or innovation and confrontation. Doing Change is exemplified by entrepreneurs who are creating new businesses that are examples of what is desired in the future. That's what Catalyst2030 (<https://catalyst2030.net/>) is organizing people to do. Forcing Change emphasizes destruction and confrontation (think of the early activities of Extinction Rebellion) that puts change pressure on the system, without focusing on solutions. Directing Change emphasizes destruction with collaboration, often by working for change from within the system as CSR and sustainability officers do in companies. Cocreating change, which I sometimes call the Lover's Strategy, involves collaborative efforts, for example, activities within multi-stakeholder forums like the Forest Stewardship Council. It strikes me that all four strategies need to happen, often by different groups, in effective transformation systems.

There are numerous subsets and pieces of a transformation system, but generating an effective and powerful transformation system explicitly has the notion of accessing the energy of all four strategies as necessary for realizing transformation.

Ju Young: Great. I would like to go back to your point that Bounce Beyond is distinctive in that it will work to bring together the whole ‘next economy initiatives.’ What do you specifically mean by ‘next economies’?

Steve: That relates very specifically to values aspects of what we're dealing with in the sense that it's a different value system, right?

Sandra: We believe that next economies are emerging effects that are enacting a values-based set of principles that aim towards real wealth in the form of a flourishing world for all—all people as well as non-human beings. The original meaning of ‘wealth’ was wellbeing or prosperity, not just financial or monetary gains. Next economies, as we see them, are aiming at wellbeing for all, where ‘all’ can include non-human beings, too. We have generally adopted a set of six values that I articulated in a recent paper (Waddock, 2020). One of the values is stewardship of the whole system. Instead of fragmenting things, and just making sure that the parts are working, that value really means monitoring and guiding the whole system. A second value focuses on what Donaldson and Walsh (2015) called creating collective value as opposed to just monetary value. That collective value is going to be different depending on the particular system that you're interested in.

A third value is governance through what is called cosmopolitan localism. Kossoff (2019) has written extensively about that idea, which means that you're pushing decisions down to the most

local possible level, following the idea of subsidiarity. That is, decisions are pushed down to the lowest possible place where they can be made effectively, while still recognizing that the global level exists and that you are connected to it.

Then there is the related value of the combination of values of regenerativity, reciprocity, and circularity, which come right out of Indigenous wisdom. This value recognizes that we are all related to each other, and to the Earth, and thus what we do in our production systems when to make products and deliver needs to be done regeneratively. It recognizes that what is waste in one system needs to become food for the next system (McDonough & Braungart, 2010). Following that value fully would eliminate toxins and regenerate the soil so that it can continue to support the human project. I just watched this wonderful movie called *Kiss the Earth*, which talks about how depleted topsoil is. It talks about regenerative farming, making agriculture a solution to putting carbon back in the earth, and also creating all kinds of diversity in the process. Diversity is also embedded in these related values, too.

Another value is that of relationship and connectedness, recognizing that as the African saying *Ubuntu* goes, 'I am because you are', or the Lakota saying of Mitákuye Oyás'íŋ, 'We are all relations. All are one.' That is, we humans are all related to and interdependent with other beings—to the animals, to the trees, to the grass that grows, to the rocks and mountains. The final value is around creating not just free markets, but fair and equitable markets and trade. So those six values, which come out of a lot of different literature, are deeply embedded in Bounce Beyond's approach.

Steve: Then it is about the theory of change. So how can we give life to those values, to the point where they become the dominant force of values of the new paradigm, contrasting with the corrosive ones of our current paradigm? Our theory of change starts with the understanding that there are all types of forces that you can't stop, but you can potentially use to provide energy for the change that you're aspiring for. Covid-19 gives us a great example. It arose from the natural environment, from human interactions with nature, and it has provided an opening for being able to bring about new change because it provides a challenge to the current system. It really has highlighted where inequality and problems with the current systems exist and they have become much more apparent.

We know that there were already lots of initiatives that were trying to expose the economic values of the current system and that were proposing what we call new or next economies. People are doing real work around trying to support these types of changes. But they are all very small, and they're fragmented. If you think of the innovation adoption curve (Rogers, 1995), we think of them as being innovators and early adopters. The impact of the innovation at this period is quite peripheral to the dominant system. The next economies' innovations are usually led by charismatic people. So they're very dependent on individual personality. Their initiators tend to be people who are much more, in a positive sense, about proselytizing. When you proselytize, you believe everyone has to understand the details of what you're talking about, and should really spend time doing what you suggest. Well, these innovators have developed a lot of projects and a lot of initiatives around the world that have this range of labels, including Doughnut Economics (Raworth, 2017), circular economics (Stahel, 2016), regenerative capitalism

(Fullerton, 2015), et cetera. They formed in the early stages of transformation or innovation around these personalities and these labels.

Becoming mainstream, however, requires getting what is known as the ‘early majority’ to accept and buy into those labels in a process called ‘crossing the chasm’ between innovators and early adopters. The goal is to get an early *majority* of people using the innovation (Moore, 1991). If the early majority just perceives a lot of dissonance or a lot of fragmentation, they're going to get confused. They might ask ‘What's the difference between regenerative and circular and doughnut economies?’ They just see a confusion of all of these things without understanding how they apply to their own situation. The early majority are pragmatists. They just want to get on with their lives without having to understand the details of how things work. Yet they do sense that there is something wrong with the current system, and they want to support changing it. They will if it is easily accessible. So to get this larger group to adopt the next economies’ innovations, we have to move away from the labels and the expectation that people are going to understand, for example, about how to recycle. We need to get to the point that it is just obvious how you recycle or do whatever is needed to generate the next economy.

Let's take a very minor example. What we see emerging in different communities around the world is what we call the next economies’ infrastructure. The way I describe this infrastructure is that it has two characteristics. One is that it supports the generation of next economies’ economic activity, like the new production structures of a B Corporation business. Second, it really embeds the new value system that Sandra talked about.

When you look at the current economy, people use the currency that they don't think twice about. Well, now they think a little bit about cryptocurrency. Mostly, we have fiat currencies, what we know as money, but they have only been dominant for the last 100 to 150 years. They haven't been around that long. They represent a particular value system that is based upon the nation-state and a particular set of values associated with that such as GDP maximization. How do we redesign currencies so that they integrate these six values that Sandra referred to?

Well, there is a fascinating example of that, that's called SEEDS (<https://joinseeds.earth/>). It is a very sophisticated type of cryptocurrency that does not have all of the negative characteristics usually associated with cryptocurrencies, like using lots of energy and being focused upon providing wealth for the inventor. It has a very different logic behind it. SEEDS is designing a new logic of aligning money with regenerative values into the currency infrastructure supported by these next economies’ values. This new infrastructure represents the core elements of a functioning economy that are starting to emerge in diverse locations around the world.

We believe that by connecting such innovations – the next economies’ currency system, stock markets, marketplaces for the exchange of goods and services – we will create the core infrastructure for new/next economies. But right now, there is just too much fragmentation, so people have to use a regular currency as well as the SEEDS currency (as an example). By creating awareness of the whole and bringing about coherence and connection among all these people, and focusing upon the values and the direction of the transformation, rather than their labels, we can give rise to this next economy.

Sandra: Maybe you could just put that in the context of one of the CoNECTs, maybe the seafood one? Just to explain, CoNECTs, as we call them, are Collaborating Next Economics and Communities in Transformation. They are the next economy initiatives that we are working with. At this time, there are four of them—Global Seafood, the bioregion of South Devon in the United Kingdom, Regenerative Costa Rica—the whole country, and the Social Purpose Institute in Canada.

Steve: One of our CoNECTs is called the Global Seafood Transformation Group. There was somebody who came to me and said, ‘We’re trying to figure out what the next stage of development is of realizing sustainable seafood, everyone feels like we’re stuck.’ And I said, ‘Well, how about this transformation system model?’ And they were all very excited about that, including a major foundation. They could see that our approach could help them put their hands around this very messy set of actors involved in seafood strategy development, and how to begin to think about the whole seafood system.

A half dozen leads of seafood sustainability initiatives were brought together. At the same time, some of that group were developing something called the Global Hub. They were trying to pull together all of these different actors, onto a virtual platform. These two things are happening at the same time, and they’re very closely connected. Bounce Beyond is working with the community using the transformations systems approach to see how to move things ahead, with mapping and a Three Horizons visioning and action strategy process (Sharpe, Hodgson, Leicester, Lyon, & Fazey, 2016) to describe pathways to their desired future. They described the current problems, defined a possible sustainable future, and then evolved a set of pathways to get there. Now we’re focusing on how can we help them actualize and really develop that pathway to the future they have envisioned.

Sandra: Bounce Beyond offers ways of connecting currently fragmented, isolated, or uncoordinated actors together. It also offers some tools and techniques, like Three Horizons, various mapping approaches, and narrative development, because people in our community are very knowledgeable about a variety of different approaches to change. I like to say we connect them, help them cohere their efforts, and then amplify their impacts.

Mapping is important because you can’t really change the system unless you know who’s in the system, what they are doing, and what its boundaries are, though those boundaries are obviously porous. It is important to think about mapping who is in the system, and how they relate to each other. There is a number of techniques you can use to do that. So that is part of seeing the system so then you can collaboratively develop your goals, story, or your new narrative, and the new ways you’re approaching them.

Ju Young: How do you recruit relevant initiatives? Do you reach out to them or do they come to you?

Sandra: That’s how we got this interview, actually. Bounce Beyond issued a call for people in relevant initiatives to self-nominate to join with us, we are at the very early stages of creating a broader community.

Steve: The initial four CoNECTs were identified as having a series of characteristics. One was that one of us in the stewardship team had a relatively strong relationship with these four initial CoNECTs. That is because we wanted to pilot work with them. Piloting is a demanding activity because there's going to be confusion. We needed to work with people who would trust and work with us and others.

Another core quality was diversity. Two of the first four are led by men and two by women. One is in a southern country, Regenerative Costa Rica. One is global, that is global seafood. Another is in Canada, which is a northern country, and one is a bioregion in the UK. So they have different boundaries. They have different mental models, they're different frameworks and different focuses. We wanted diversity to test how our theory of working with them would work out, whether there were some it would work with better than others.

I was also going to answer your question more specifically about the infrastructure for the next economies, and how that relates to the seafood community. One example of this infrastructure that the seafood community has developed totally independently without Bounce Beyond is called pre-competitive agreements. Groups of competitors form, for example, retail, the restaurant industry, and others, and they collectively say they want sustainable seafood and they're willing to financially support it. But that requires more than one restaurant getting together to pay for it (to raise more money and so they don't put themselves at a disadvantage). So they collaborate around projects like that to be able to support the emergence of sustainable seafood, although they're actually competitors in a market. We have brought to this group, this idea of a new financing system, we call ecosystems for financing transformation. It arises from looking at another example of next economies infrastructure. So we're discussing how to create this financing infrastructure in the global seafood arena. We have launched a research project to identify other aspects of that emerging next economies' infrastructure and to identify more examples. We're doing this with Catalyst2030 and GANE, with the vision of further developing and expanding the use of the next economies' infrastructure.

Ju Young: To close off the interview, is there any other aspect of Bounce Beyond that we haven't yet covered, but you think is important?

Steve: I think it's useful for people to understand that Bounce Beyond is a self-organizing initiative. It's not as though we have been sponsored by some organization. Bounce Beyond's predecessor, the SDG Transformation Forum, was never a legal entity. Right now, Bounce Beyond is not a legal entity either. Instead, it is about the power of citizens to be able to gather together to have an impact in an audacious way. I love making that real, and I just think that there's much more that can be done. We are getting to a point where we need a fiscal sponsor and a fiscal agent. But Bounce Beyond so far is really about the commitment of this group of about a dozen people who have made this possible.

Sandra: We go back around to the idea of complexity, and the emergence that comes out of healthy complex systems. When you bring together a group of people who are interested in bringing about a better world. Thus, Steve is the innovator here, and he's the transformation catalyst for this group, in a sense, because he has brought these people together in generative ways to try to work through what we are doing as a general goal. But what has happened over the

last year is that Bounce Beyond as it is today has emerged out of our conversations and out of the interactions and all of the work that we've done together. It was not something that we could have predicted, although Steve may well have had it in his mind at the start. But none of the rest of us could have predicted this. It is because of the genius of Steve bringing together people who have certain skills, very different skills--everybody in our group is really different from everybody else—bringing them all together, sort of mixing them together, and sort of watching what comes out of that. In a sense, that's what Bounce Beyond does when it does some of its work—we will use a process for visioning the desired future and think about how we, where 'we' is everyone in the CoNECT, for example, can get there. Then we see through various mapping processes what already exists in the system and think about what more (or sometimes less) is needed there for actions to be more impactful. Then we help them work to figure out where they can work together more effectively, do different or more impactful things, avoid overlaps, and generally take more strategic actions—what we call radical action and learning initiatives. It is finding people with skills to do that type of work that is what Steve does so brilliantly.

Steve: The piece that I'm most delighted with is that everyone has found their place within Bounce Beyond. It was not me saying, I'm going to hire you to be a communications person. The person who has taken on that role said in a meeting we had earlier, 'Well, I didn't come here thinking I'm a comms person. But I realized that that's what I can do.' She does have a talent for it, and similarly, other steward team members have found their places quite uniquely so it's a complementary set of skills, roles, and individuals that just emerged by working together and having people have become aware of each other and their respective competencies and passions.

Sandra: Yeah, it is partly about a passion to change the world. What Steve does is identify people, essentially, who have that passion, and some knowledge or some skill to contribute and pulls them together. None of Bounce Beyond would be in existence without Steve and to that particular capacity, which is so unusual and unique. I've never met anyone else who has this particular way of doing it.

Ju Young: Yeah. I really appreciate all the work that you are doing with Bounce Beyond. Thank you so much for your time and insights. I learned a lot and I hope that Bounce Beyond could become a true catalyst for transformational system change as its name suggests!

References

- Donaldson, T., & Walsh, J. P. 2015. Research in organizational behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 35: 181–207.
- Fullerton, J. 2015. *Regenerative Capitalism: How Universal Principles and Patterns Will Shape Our New Economy*. Captial Institute.
<http://capitalinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/2015-Regenerative-Capitalism-4-20-15-final.pdf>.
- Hawken, P. (2007). *Blessed unrest : How the largest movement in the world came into being, and why no one saw it coming*. New York: Viking.
- Kossoff, G. 2019. Cosmopolitan Localism: The Planetary Networking of Everyday Life in Place. *Cuadernos Del Centro de Estudios En Diseño y Comunicación. Ensayos*, (73): 51–66.
- McDonough, W., & Braungart, M. 2010. *Cradle to Cradle: Remaking the Way We Make Things*. Albany, NY: North Point Press.
- Moore, G. A. 1991. *Crossing the Chasm: Marketing and Selling Technology Project*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Raworth, K. 2017. *Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Rogers, E. M. 1995. *Diffusion of Innovations* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Sharpe, B., Hodgson, A., Leicester, G., Lyon, A., & Fazey, I. (2016). Three horizons: A pathways practice for transformation. *Ecology and Society*, 21(2).
- Stahel, W. R. 2016. The circular economy. *Nature*, 531(7595): 435–438.
- Waddell, S. 2018. Four Strategies for Large Systems Change. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 42–47.
- Waddock, S. 2020. Reframing and Transforming Economics around Life. *Sustainability*, 12(18): 7553.
- Waddock, S., Meszoely, G. M., Waddell, S., & Dentoni, D. 2015. The complexity of wicked problems in large scale change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 28(6): 993–1012.
- Waddock, S., & Waddell, S. 2021. Transformation Catalysts: Weaving Transformational Change for a Flourishing World for All. *Cadmus*, 4(4): 165–182.
- Waddock, S., Waddell, S., Goldstein, B., Linner, B.-O., Schäpke, N., et al. 2020. Transformation: How to spur radical change. In A. Scrutton (Ed.), *Our Future on Earth Report*: 82–90. Future Earth.